

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-15, 20 and 22-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 9 are independent claims. Claims 22-24 have been added. Claims 3-5 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 15 and 20 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1-5, 8-15 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. RE37591E to Shimada et al. (Shimada). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a display panel including a light leakage prevention film comprised of a plurality of protruding portions of said gate lines, said protruding portions extending between said gate lines and/or data lines of the array peripheral region, for preventing light leakage. Independent claim 9 has been similarly amended to recite a combination of steps in a method for manufacturing a display panel including forming a light leakage prevention

film comprised of a plurality of protruding portions of said gate lines and/or data lines, said protruding portions extending between said gate lines and/or the data lines of the array peripheral region to prevent light leakage.

Applicants respectfully submit that these combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Shimada.

The Examiner states that Shimada discloses a light leakage prevention film (light shield 9) formed between the gate lines of the array peripheral region. Film 9 is shown in Fig. 3 of Shimada (referenced by the Examiner), and is also shown in Figs. 4, 5A, 5B, 5C, 6 and 7. It appears plainly from all of these figures that film 9 is not a portion of the gate line. Still further, film 9 is not comprised of a plurality of protruded portions.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Shimada fails to teach or suggest the combinations of elements recited above in independent claims 1 and 9 (as amended).

Further, in the Response filed on April 23, 2004, it was argued substantially, *inter alia*, that the **Shimada patent seeks to avoid using a black matrix** on the counter substrate because of the problems associated therewith. The arguments presented therein are hereby fully incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 3-5, claims 3-5 have been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection thereof moot. With regard to dependent claims 2, 8, 10-15 and 20, Applicants submit that claims 2, 8, 10-15 and 20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 9, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2, 8, 10-15 and 20 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1 and 9. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

CLAIMS 22-24

Claims 22-24 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 22-24 depend, either directly or indirectly on independent claim 1, and therefore are allowable based on their dependence from independent claim 1. Consideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and earnestly solicit an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.


Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Percy L. Square (Registration No. 51,084) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Applicant(s) respectfully petitions under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) and 1.17 for a one-month extension of time in which to respond to the Examiner's Office Action. The Extension of Time Fee in the amount of \$110.00 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
James T. Eller, Jr., # 39,538
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747
(703) 205-8000


JTE/PLS:jls:sld